
T H E

C R I S I S.

N U M B E R L X V. *To be continued Weekly,*
DURING THE PRESENT BLOODY CIVIL WAR IN AMERICA.

SATURDAY, *April* 13, 1776, [Price Two-pence Halfpenny]

Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.

H O R.

Slave to no party *truth* alone I praise,
Nor swallow *falsehood* tho' it comes from *Hayer*.

T O L O R D C H A T H A M.†

My L O R D,



Have just read a letter given to the public in one of the daily papers, under the sanction of your lordship's name. As the style marks it for your lordship's and the sentiments coincide with those delivered by *Lord Temple* in the house of peers, I cannot doubt of its authenticity. When I consider that your lordship (in and out of office) has always figured as a *patriot* in the senate, I cannot behold you without concern in a sick bed transformed to a *tyrant* and a *parricide*. Your lordship's letter is now before me, and I shall take leave to comment upon it with the greatest freedom, forgive me, sir, but I cannot permit you to mislead that nation in your retirement, which you once advanced to the highest pitch of glory, in a short, but wise and spirited administration---your lordship is pleased to declare that "your present sentiments *happily* coincide with those delivered by your brother *Temple*"--*happily* do you say my lord?--very *unhappily*

† The letter which our correspondent alludes to has been contradicted, but not by Lord Chatham's authority as the public yet know: we have therefore thought proper to insert the following address to his lordship, from the high esteem we have for that nobleman, and in hopes he will satisfy the world, by publicly disavowing the nefarious production said to be HIS.

surely

surely, both for *England* and *America*; very *unhappily* for *yourself*---such a declaration from Lord *Chatham* argues great *instability*, if not *insanity* of mind. Are not you the identical personage, who (when the propriety of the *stamp act* was agitated in the house of commons) *rejoiced* that *America* had *resisted*? were not these your lordship's words? does she do more at this present moment than persevere in that *resistance* which you once applauded? she certainly does not.

Give me leave to ask by what accident your lordship and your noble brother happened to think alike? did he submit so far as to deliver your sentiments, or did your lordship condescend to adopt his? the latter conjecture is highly improbable. Your lordship was never yet known to coincide with any man. In *politics* you have ever disclaimed all union where you was not allowed to *guide*. It is therefore most likely that your brother *Temple* pronounced your lordships sentiments; how greatly they are changed, with what reason, and through what *influence*, I shall proceed to observe, consider, and investigate.

Your lordship's letter informs us that "whilst *America* retained her *allegiance* you was the friend of *America*,"---with how ill a grace does this stricture upon *America* flow from the heart, or pen, of that man who first excited *America* to *resist*? yes, my lord, it was your oracular, applauding breath which first encouraged her to resent, consult, and *act*. She looked upon you as a tutelar-divinity. And are you to be drawn off by the sweet smelling favour of a little *ministerial sacrifice*? made almost to your lordship's *manes*, perhaps upon your *deathbed*?---*America* has been so often and so fully cleared from every imputed breach of allegiance, not only in the public prints, but by the ablest and honestest members in both houses of parliament, that it would be impertinently tedious of me to take up her defence anew. In one word, who is so able to clear her from so false an imputation as your lordship? permit me therefore, to remind your lordship of your own defence of her upon this head in the House of Lords on the 20th of January 1775, your lordships notions then were very different: your words were these: "The *constitution* and that alone limits both *sovereignty* and *allegiance*?---what has government done? they have sent an armed force consisting of above 17000 men to *dragoon* the Bostonians into what is called their *duty*.---is this the way to win men to their duty, and recover in them the principles of affection and British allegiance?---your lordship closed thus: "when the inherent constitutional rights of *America* are invaded, I own myself an *American*; and feeling myself as such shall to the *verge of my life*, vindicate her rights"---now for the hole at which your lordship is endeavouring at present to creep out.---"But if *America* should at any time lose sight of this line (of *right*) I shall be an *Englishman*, and defend those *rights* against any power under heaven that would oppose them."---your lordship has at last thrown off your *American* mask, and not only returned the *Englishman*, but commenced a *ministerial* man; and why? has *America* transgressed this line of *right*, (these limits of the *constitution*) by not submitting to be *dragooned* by 17000 men, by contending for her inherent constitutional rights

rights, when they were invaded? by opposing the unjustifiable force of her aggressors, or by resisting *murderous* troops who dared to shed her blood? by whom was this *line of right* transgressed, my lord? you must own it was by *England*; a noble breast must disdain a *falsehood*. If your lordship will not now confess yourself an *American* once more, I must tell you that you are unworthy to be called an *Englishman*,---but your lordship is certainly under some stronger impulse than *ministerial*---you exclaim that “there is no treating with *rebels*, whilst “arms were in the hands, honour, dignity, authority, interest all “forbid it.” this is not the language of Lord *Chatham* in his senses, does your lordship forget the difference between constitutional *resistance* and unnatural *rebellion*? are you a *revolutionist* without a veneration for revolution principles? did not the renowned and immortal *rebels* of that glorious æra, take up arms against unconstitutional power and oppression? has *America* any greater sin to answer for? as to the honour and dignity of this, and every civilized nation, they consist in *justice* and *humanity*; it is authority must move (as your lordship has often said) within the limits of the constitution, and it is *interest* must be maintained by cherishing, protecting, and uniting, not by plundering, invading, and dismembering its dominions. A government thus principled would not have suffered (much less would it have aided) the executive power to break through *charters*, compacts, oaths and above all the sacred principles of the *revolution*, for the gratification of *regal pride and profusion*, for the sake of opening new sources of *ministerial corruption*, or indulging a pusillanimous spirit of impotent and ruinous *revenge*; ruinous my lord, it must be to this country, and heinously unjust, after every assurance of loyal attachment, every wise concession and earnest supplication had been made by injured *America*, and spurned from the senate and the throne, by the feet of unrelenting tyrants. Such they appear to all the world, and such your lordship will, at the last, appear, unless you dye as you have hitherto lived, a friend to *America* and *freedom*, and a determined foe to *despotic* men and measures.

But your lordship says, “the present state of things does not admit of *relaxation* or *concession*.”---who drove them to such a *crisis*, the aggressors or the sufferers, my lord? if justice and necessity require such *relaxation* and *concession*, the pride of kings must stoop, or the nation be undone.---” All *conciliatory propositions* are futile”---There was a time when they ought to have been embraced, my lord, they were repeatedly tendered by the friends of *America* and *England*; by *America* herself, had rejected with disdain, under a pretence that they proceeded from the *Congress*, this alas! was a mere pretence to give a colour to unjustifiable despotic *perseverance*. How could a collective body of people join in an address without they met together? the terms *congress* and *meeting* are synonymous. A repulse grounded on a poor reason was ridiculous and irrational; but *America* has lately, very lately, renewed her solicitations for peace in the humblest terms, in terms which must be the most satisfactory to any but determined and designing tyrants. Yet fresh *armaments* are mustered from *foreign countries* to continue an invasion commenced against every principle of justice, humanity, sound policy, and the British constitution. The truth is,
it

it would frustrate the despotic schemes of the present *administration* either to offer, or receive, any *conciliatory propositions*; confident in their hired *myrmidons* they rejoice to see the day when such *propositions* are become *futile* in the opinion of *Lord Chatham*.

"The colonies have levy'd open war against the present state." For the sake of truth, my lord, if that was ever an object of your veneration and respect, retract this rash, ill-grounded, false assertion. When your lordship made your last motion for a *conciliation* in the house of lords, was not a British army of *invasion* posted in the town of *Boston*? did they not shortly after make the *first* attack upon *America*? I am sorry to draw a blush from your lordship upon this occasion; no character however great can sanctify a *falsehood*.--- "That expence is not to be regarded.---That *national honour* is above all estimate", I readily admit, but deny that the treasures of England are to be dissipated, like counters, in an unnatural, unjust, and impious war against *ourselves*. I deny that the honour of a nation ever has, or can appear, in such a contest; which was commenced upon narrow, false, impolitic, and selfish principles, (merely to feed rapine, prodigality, and corruption) and must terminate not only in the disgrace, but in the ruin of domestic peace, extended commerce, national reputation, and prosperity,

"*America*, says your lordship must be brought back to her duty," taking it for granted, (but not admitting) that the *Americans* have departed from their *duty*, (unless *self defence* is a departure) I should be glad to know why they have not been permitted to return *spontaneously* to what your lordship may now call their *duty*; but I call a free exercise of those rights which they have been stripped of?---why were their repeated *supplications* answered by famine, sword, and fire?--- Again, "*America* must submit to the *constitutional* authority of Great Britain."---I concur most heartily with your lordship, observing only that the *constitutional estates* of this kingdom have, in the case of *America*, proceeded most *unconstitutionally*.---But your lordship adds, that "the submission of *America* must be absolute, unlimited, and unconditional; then will be the time to temper *justice* with *humanity*." This is the very language of the *minister* of *Bute*, *Mansfield*, and *George* himself, in his late answer to the last address of the city of London. Alas! my lords how does evil communications corrupt good manners! should *America* make so abject a submission, even in the dust, she will deserve not only to be deserted by your lordship and all her friends, but to be despised and trampled into *slavery*.

That the time is not yet come for the exertion of *justice* and *humanity* towards her, is a disgrace not only to this free nation (as it is called) but to *humanity* itself.---Your lordship disclaims the defence of *all* the measures of *administration* most religiously---why so, my lord, if you have taken courage to defend the very *worst* of all? that your lordship may add a most remarkable phenomenon in the British annals in 1776, let me intreat you to make your *apostacy* complete.

plete. I will venture to foretell that neither your *conversion*, nor your brother *Temple's*, so near your dissolutions, can have the desired effect upon the public. Our wise *tampering* ministry is quite mistaken.

I pass over your lordship's next expressions (applauding the hiring of German troops to cut the throats of *Englishmen*, and pitying the deluded colonists, and I pass them over with the greatest pity and contempt---they denote *insanity*---and to the next sentence, I believe your lordship dictated it to a *lucid interval*, because it is pregnant with a *paradox*. In such species of assertion your lordship has ever stood unrivalled and alone.---hear it, all ye listening world!---“ I say the “ present armament will restore the Americans to *freedom*.---pardon me, my lord, but I can hardly suppress a laugh. It deserves no other answer---what your lordship says about *republicanism*, will but be answered by the event.---Your lordship in your close approves most of limited monarchy---I would ask your lordship whether ours is, at present a *limited* monarchy in reality and in truth, or whether it is only the shadow without the substance? be this as it may, I will aver that a *limited English* monarch at the head of a venal majority in parliament, is as absolute as the *Grand Signior*.

That I may not quit your lordship without some token of respect, permit me to assure you, that I should not have taken the liberty of a commentator with any correspondence between your lordship and your friends, which had not been manifestly designed for the public eye. Your late epistle has been a subject of general surprize, I wish I could say of general applause; various have been the conjectures formed. The *apostacy* of the great *Pulteny*, afterwards the little *Earl of Bath*, is frequently brought to mind; accomplished by a crafty minister, who knew the weakness of mankind, and a vain importunate woman.

Your lordship some time since upon a remarkable occasion declared “ you would live and dye with your noble brother,”---I now perceive, my lord, that your *juns* will set together. The minister has kept his eye upon them for some time, watching for their decline; the thane of *Bute* (under whose influence your lordship now begins to write, and your noble brother to harangue) knows that man is most accessible when he is upon the verge of *necessity*, or *death*. Both your lordships seem now to have lived (for your own glory) long enough; I know not who is lord *Chatham's amanuensis*, but lord *Temple* is his *mouth*; the speech and the letter have the honour of one common parent in your lordship. Thus have you two able lords given the triumphant thane a dutiful earnest of obedience for the future.

In the debate upon the *American Stamp Act*, I remember your lordship declared in the house of commons, that “ you could give no ministry your *confidence*, because you could perceive a latent *influence*.” you meant the influence of *Bute*. Alas! my lord, how little do the
wisest

wisest of us know ourselves ! what *American*, what *Englishman*, can now confide in either of your lordships ? now, when this once-detested influence shines as strong upon the noble invalids at *Hayes* and *Stowe*, as upon the rotten chapel of *St. Stephen* ?

Your lordships have formerly spoken many applauded, *patriotic* truths in public ; you have laid open the errors of a vile and wicked administration boldly ; will your lordships condescend to hear your own ? tottering (as ye both are) upon the verge of life, your lordships have at last consented to receive *extreme unction* from the gracious hand of *Bute*. His insured patronage to young Mr. *Grenville* (whose father produced the *Stamp Act*) the successor to the estate and title of *Earl Temple*, has melted down the *patriotism* of the stormy brothers into a ministerial calm.

Thus have I as a member of that collective body, the people of *England*, whom you have deceived, and as a firm friend to *America* whom you have deserted) taken leave to fend you, at once my poor ideas of your letter, your patriotism, and your principles. I am, my lord, with much less devotion than I ever wished to be, yours, &c.

C A S C A.

Printed and Published for the AUTHORS by T. W. SHAW, Fleet-Street, opposite Anderton's Coffee-House, where Letters to the Publisher will be thankfully received.